



Joint Policy Committee

Friday, March 16, 2007
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 Noon
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 Eighth Street, Oakland

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

2.1 Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of January 19, 2007 Action

2.2 Proposed Amendments to Smart-Growth Policies—Report Back on Economic Activity and Goods Distribution Action

The Committee endorsed the bulk of the proposed amendments at its January meeting, but at the request of a member deferred the policy on Economic Activity and Goods Distribution for a clarifying report. That report is attached.

Unless there is a request by a Committee member to take up an item on the consent calendar separately, the calendar will be acted upon in one motion.

3. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Participation on the Joint Policy Committee Action

BCDC has requested to become a member agency on the JPC. The attached memo recommends actions responding to that request.

4. 2009 Regional Transportation Plan Discussion

Preparation for the next RTP is underway. MTC staff will outline the new approach proposed for this plan with particular reference to the role of the JPC and its member agencies and the relationship to *FOCUS* and Climate Change.

5. Elements of a Bay Area Strategy on Climate Change Discussion

ABAG, the Air District, and BCDC will present existing and potential climate-change initiatives, complementing and supplementing the ideas presented by MTC at the JPC's last meeting. The attached memo reports on climate-change public outreach efforts, lays out an initial set of organizing elements for a regional climate-change strategy and illustrates some ideas under each element.

6. Public Comment

7. Adjournment

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING:

10:00 a.m. to Noon
Friday, May 18, 2007
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 Eighth Street, Oakland

The JPC may take action on any item listed in the agenda.

This meeting is scheduled to end promptly at 12:00 Noon. Agenda items not considered by that time may be deferred.

The public is encouraged to comment on agenda items by completing a request-to-speak card and giving it to JPC staff or the chairperson.

Although a quorum of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission may be in attendance at this meeting, the Joint Policy Committee may take action only on those matters delegated to it. The Joint Policy Committee may not take any action as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission unless this meeting has been previously noticed as a Metropolitan Transportation Commission meeting.



**Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee

Minutes of the Meeting of January 19, 2007 Held at 10:00 AM in the MetroCenter Auditorium, Oakland

Attendance:

ABAG Members:

Jane Brunner
Dave Cortese
Mark Green
Scott Haggerty
Rose Jacobs Gibson
Gwen Regalia

BAAQMD Members:

Chris Daly
Jerry Hill
Patrick Kwok
Mark Ross, Chair
Pamela Torliatt
Gayle Uilkema, V. Ch.

MTC Members:

Bill Dodd
Steve Kinsey
John McLemore
Jon Rubin
Jim Spering
Shelia Young

Secretary of BTH

Jim Bourgart

ABAG Staff:

Marisa Cravens
Randy Deshazo
Henry Gardner
Jaqueline Guzman
Patricia Jones
Ken Moy
Christy Riviere
Jonathan Strunin

BAAQMD Staff:

Jack Broadbent
Henry Hilken
Jean Roggenkamp
David Vintze

MTC Staff:

James Corless
Frank Harris
Steve Heminger
Doug Johnson
Ashley Nguyen

Other:

Chris Brittle, Consultant to MTC
Anne Halsted, BCDC
Bruce Riordan, Elmwood Consulting
David Schonbrunn
Will Travis, BCDC

JPC Staff:

Ted Droettboom

1. Call to Order

Chair Ross called the meeting to order.

2. Consent Calendar

2.1 Approval of the Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of November 17, 2006

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2.2 Proposed Amendments to Smart-Growth Policies

The recommendations in the staff memo were approved with the exception of that referring to the proposed policy on “Economic Activity and Goods Distribution.” A clarifying report on this policy was requested for the next JPC meeting.

2.3 JPC Composition and Size

The recommendations in the staff memorandum were approved.

3. 2007 *FOCUS* Program

The recommendations in the staff memorandum were approved.

4. *FOCUS* Incentives: Legislation and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

The recommendations in the staff memorandum were approved.

5. Climate Change Strategy

Bruce Riordan presented some ideas he and Chris Brittle have been developing on behalf of MTC to address the large role which the transportation sector plays in the Bay Area’s climate-change picture. At fifty percent, transportation is by far the largest contributor to this region’s greenhouse-gas emissions. Transportation infrastructure, much of which is subject to inundation under likely sea-level-rise scenarios, will also be heavily affected by climate change..

As most of the region’s transportation CO₂ emissions are due to personal vehicle use and as each gallon of gasoline burned in those vehicles produces about twenty pounds of CO₂, most of work which Bruce and Chris have been doing has been directed at personal vehicles. There are two principal ways of reducing personal vehicle emissions: (1) to increase fuel-efficiency and (2) to reduce vehicle travel. Bruce talked about twenty-two strategies in seven categories to improve efficiency and reduce driving. These included various changes in vehicle technology and fuels, reducing highway speeds and aggressive driving behaviors, accelerating fleet turnover, traffic signal improvements, enhanced smart growth, transportation-demand-management (TDM) measures, and a variety of taxes, fees, rationing schemes and other price signals.

Bruce also talked about the possibility of carbon offsets to mitigate the impacts of individual behaviors which contribute to emissions, and he noted the potential of the Bay Area to exhibit leadership and to innovate world-class examples which others could follow.

Committee and public comment addressed the need for all the regional agencies and local governments to work together on the climate-change issue, the power of focusing of interventions which offer co-benefits in addition to greenhouse gas reductions, the potential to use the carbon-footprint concept to focus public attention on individual responsibility, the potential of parking charges to send price signals, and the necessity to be very conscious of equity consequences.

6. Other Business

There was none.

7. Public Comment

All public comment was received relative to specific agenda items and is incorporated in the summary of those items.

8. Adjournment



Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee/Regional Planning Program

Date: March 6, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: Amended Smart-Growth Preamble and Policies—Policy on Economic Activity and Goods Distribution

At its meeting of January 19, 2007, the JPC endorsed all but one of a set of proposed amendments to the Bay Area's Smart-Growth Preamble and Policies. At the urging of a representative of the City of Oakland, a clarifying report back was requested on one proposed new policy:

Economic Activity and Goods Distribution

Encourage planning and development that respects the public and private infrastructure required for the maintenance of a prosperous regional economy and for the efficient provision and distribution of goods and services.

This memo provides information on the rationale and intent of the proposed policy.

Rationale

The *Smart Growth Strategy / Regional Livability Footprint Project* was started at a time when the Bay Area economy was booming, and it is likely that the impact of the dot-com bust had not fully sunk in when the *Project* wound down in 2002. For whatever reason, economic development issues do not enjoy high standing in either the *Project's* final report or in the *Preamble and Policies* adopted in late 2002. Since 2002, the region's goods movement study and some local planning exercises have pointed to potential land-use competition between "smart" residential development and goods-distribution facilities. Our transit-oriented development work has also highlighted possible conflicts between proposed residential densities and established industrial activities; and there has been a general concern about residential development foreclosing opportunities for job generators. A policy sensitive to these economic concerns is appropriate.

Intent

The policy is intended to be read not in isolation, but in the context of the Bay Area's entire *Smart-Growth Preamble and Policies*, as amended and attached to this memo. In that context, it is clear that smart growth involves balance and trade-off among a number of complementary and occasionally conflicting objectives. The Economic Activity and Goods Distribution policy is intended to add another consideration to the many which the region needs to take into account as it continues to grow and develop. It is not intended to be any more important or over-riding than

any of the other smart-growth policies. All the policies are about general direction; they are not about hard and fast rules.

Further, with one limited exception, BCDC, the regional agencies that have adopted the *Smart-Growth Preamble and Policies* have no formal land-use authority. Except for BCDC's one-hundred-foot doughnut of Bay shoreline, land-use planning remains the domain of local governments. Regional agencies can advise and provide incentives, but they cannot dictate.

For the most part, the original policies seem to have been drafted to be deliberately vague, and the proposed amendments do not venture far from that precedent. The informal, positive nature of the regional agency intent is also implied by the action verbs used to articulate the policies. The policies use words like "encourage," "promote," "improve" and "enhance. They do not use words like "prohibit" or "restrict," and they do not make absolute choices among alternatives.

In sum, the policies have all the mild manners of a Clark Kent and none of the powers of a Superman. For that reason, it is not surprising that, after review, staff at the City of Oakland have indicated that they have no problems with the proposed policy as presently worded.

Recommendation

I RECOMMEND:

THAT the JPC endorse the proposed policy on Economic Activity and Goods Distribution.

Attachment B

SMART-GROWTH PREAMBLE AND POLICIES (AS AMENDED)

Preamble

Current land-use patterns in the San Francisco Bay Area are putting intense pressure on the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of the Bay Area and of surrounding regions. The projected addition of over one million new residents and one million new jobs in the coming decades will further challenge our ability to sustain the high quality of life we enjoy today.

To help meet this challenge, the five regional agencies of the Bay Region—the Association of Bay Area Governments, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Regional Water Quality Control Board—along with the economy, environment and social equity caucuses of the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, developed a set of Smart Growth policies.

The policies reflect the values articulated by workshop participants of the Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project and address Bay Area conditions. The policies are consistent with widely accepted notions of smart growth. They are meant to encourage meaningful participation from local governments, stakeholders and residents.

The policies provide a framework for decision-making on development patterns, housing, transportation, environment, infrastructure, governmental fiscal health and social equity that can lead us toward development of vibrant neighborhoods, preservation of open space, clean air and water, and enhanced mobility choices, while enhancing the Bay Area's relationship with surrounding regions.

Policies

Jobs/Housing Balance and Match

Improve the jobs/housing linkages through the development of housing in proximity to jobs, and both in proximity to public transportation. Increase the supply of affordable housing and support efforts to match job income and housing affordability levels.

Housing and Displacement

Improve existing housing and develop sufficient new housing to provide for the housing needs of the Bay Area community. Support efforts to improve housing affordability and limit the displacement of existing residents and businesses.

Social Justice and Equity

Improve conditions in disadvantaged neighborhoods, ensure environmental justice, and improve access to jobs, housing, public services and good schools for all residents in the region.

Health and Safety

Promote and protect public health and safety by locating and designing development with sensitivity to natural and man-made risks, by reducing these risks where appropriate and feasible, and by facilitating healthy and safe behaviors.

Environmental, Natural Resource, Open Space and Agricultural Preservation

Protect and enhance open space, agricultural lands, other valued lands, watersheds and ecosystems throughout the region. Promote development patterns and building technologies that protect and improve air quality, conserve resources and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Protect and enhance the San Francisco Bay and Estuary. Protect scenic, historic, and cultural resources that contribute to the region's identity.

Future Urban Development

Anticipate and prepare for future urban expansion by discouraging the premature subdivision of agricultural and vacant land for low-density residential development that cannot be efficiently served by transit, which does not provide for the complete range of infrastructure, uses and services required to meet the daily needs of residents and which is located without regard to proximate employment opportunities.

Economic Activity and Goods Distribution

Encourage planning and development that respects the public and private infrastructure required for the maintenance of a prosperous regional economy and for the efficient provision and distribution of goods and services.

Mobility, Livability and Transit Support

Enhance community livability by promoting infill, transit oriented and walkable communities, and compact development as appropriate. Develop multi-family housing, mixed-use development, and alternative transportation to improve opportunities for all members of the community.

Local and Regional Transportation Efficiencies

Promote opportunities for transit use and alternative modes of transportation including improved rail, bus, high occupancy (HOV) systems, and ferry services as well as enhanced walking and biking. Increase connectivity between and strengthen alternative modes of transportation, including improved rail, bus, ride share and ferry services as well as walking and biking. Promote investments that adequately maintain the existing transportation system and improve the efficiency of transportation infrastructure.

Infrastructure Investments

Improve and maintain existing infrastructure and support future investments that promote smart growth, including water and land recycling, brownfield clean-up and re-use, multi-use facilities, smart building codes, green building principles, retention of historic character and resources, and provision of high-quality school capacity.

Local Government Fiscal Health

Improve the fiscal health of local government by promoting stable and secure revenue sources, reduced service provision costs through smart growth targeted infrastructure improvement, and state and regional sponsored fiscal incentives. Support cooperative efforts among local jurisdictions to address housing and commercial development, infrastructure costs, and provision of services.

Cooperation on Smart Growth Policies

Encourage the State, local governments, water and sewer districts, school districts, stakeholders and other constituents in the Bay Area to cooperate in supporting actions consistent with the adopted Smart Growth policies. Forge cooperative relationships with governments and stakeholders in surrounding regions to support actions that will lead to inter-regional Smart Growth benefits.



**Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee/Regional Planning Program

Date: March 5, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Participation on the Joint Policy Committee

As reported at the last JPC meeting, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has requested membership in the Joint Policy Committee. A letter from BCDC's Executive Director reporting a unanimous Commission decision to that effect is attached.

Full BCDC membership on the JPC, including voting privileges, requires a change in state legislation, and a draft spot bill to effect that change has been prepared by Legislative Counsel. Unfortunately the Assembly Member who agreed to author the bill has exceeded his bill limit, and so the proposed legislation is currently orphaned. We are confident, however, that it will be possible to graft the draft bill's language into other legislation if the JPC agrees to invite BCDC to become a member.

Staff believes that BCDC membership on the JPC would be a positive addition. BCDC has comprehensive planning and regulatory authority in all nine Bay Area counties for the Bay, Suisun Marsh and their shorelines, and through that authority plays a critical role in the land-use and transportation future of the Bay Area. And, as the JPC has already recognized, the potential for sea-level rise gives BCDC a considerable interest in the Committee's continuing consideration of climate change.

Existing legislation provides the JPC with discretion on nearly all matters with the exception of its membership composition and the requirement that it participate in the drafting of certain named regional planning instruments (i.e., the Regional Transportation Plan, the Regional Housing Needs Allocation, and Air Pollution Control Plans and Strategies). As the JPC's work continues, it may be beneficial to add other member agencies in addition to BCDC. The requirement to do this through state legislation seems unnecessarily cumbersome. Therefore, the JPC may wish to seek legislative authority to vary its composition at its will, subject to the maintenance of a core set of agencies with equal representation on the Committee (i.e., ABAG, BAAQMD, and MTC and, conditional on the consideration of this memo, BCDC).

The potential addition of BCDC raises the issue of overall Committee size. As there are currently some vacancies on the JPC, this is also a good time to consider size. The JPC currently has twenty-one voting members, seven from each member agency. The Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing (BTH) is a non-voting member. Subject to maintaining equal repre-

sentation from all member agencies and at least one member from each of the nine Bay Area counties, the JPC has self-authority over its size. The JPC last considered the issue of size in November of 2004, when the Air District was added as a member. At that time, the Committee expanded from an initial fourteen to twenty-one members.

Committee size involves a balance between objectives. A larger committee increases representation from local governments across the region and may assist in achieving greater local buy-in to regional priorities. However, as committee size grows, the quality and fullness of participation may suffer. There is less opportunity for each member to speak and to respond to the ideas of others, and members may discount the value of their presence: the less exclusive the club, the less incentive there is to join.

Assuming that the JPC is not inclined to create a situation wherein some member agencies are more equal than others, a range of reasonably feasible committee size options, incorporating BCDC as a fourth, equally represented member agency, is outlined in this simple multiplication table.

Agency Representatives	Total Committee Size
7	28
6	24
5	20
4	16
3	12

In general, a larger committee is more likely to have a more diffuse regional focus, including more local-government interests in addition to regional-agency interests. A smaller committee is more likely to concentrate on issues among the four regional agencies and is less likely to represent local diversity. Staff believes that a good balance is around the current committee size and therefore favors five representatives from each agency comprising a total committee of twenty plus the non-voting Secretary of BTH.

With four member agencies and equal representations, all options result in even numbers and the possibility of tie votes. While a potential problem, it is unlikely to occur often if at all. From a regional policy perspective, it is clearly preferable to favor near consensus over situations involving close votes.

Recommendations

I RECOMMEND:

- A. THAT the JPC accept BCDC's request to become a Committee member and that it do so on the basis that BCDC will eventually have representation and status equal to the other member agencies;

- B. THAT the JPC seek legislation giving it the authority to invite BCDC and other relevant agencies to join the Committee as full members as appropriate and required;
- C. THAT, pending legislation permitting BCDC to become a full voting member agency, it be invited to send non-voting members to participate in the JPC's meetings;
- D. THAT the JPC be composed of five representatives from each member agency plus the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing as a non-voting member.



Making San Francisco Bay Better

December 7, 2006

Mark Ross, Chair
Joint Policy Committee
MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4756

ATTENTION: Ted Droettboom

Dear Mr. Ross:

I am pleased to inform you that our Commission unanimously decided today to request that BCDC be invited to participate as a member of the Joint Policy Committee. Our Commissioners concluded that BCDC's participation on the JPC would advance a number of objectives in BCDC's strategic plan, which call for greater collaboration with other regional agencies to address critical issues such as climate change, regional sustainability, transportation, air quality and natural resource protection.

We recognize that BCDC's participation may initially present some organizational difficulties in that the current membership of the JPC is established by State law. Because we believe the Joint Policy Committee provides a critical forum at which BCDC and the other agencies can gain a better understanding of each other's work and can foster the development of consistent policy on regional issues, we are open to participating in whatever manner the JPC feels would be most effective.

Please let me know how we can most constructively proceed on this matter.

Sincerely,

WILL TRAVIS
Executive Director



**Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee/Regional Planning Program

Date: March 5, 2006

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: Elements of a Bay Area Strategy on Climate Change

At its meeting of November 17th, 2006, the JPC commenced a six-month program to study the issue of climate change and to recommend an initial set of actions to be pursued jointly by the regional agencies. We are now four months into the program and at a point where an interim report is required. This is that report. It summarizes our work to date and lays out a preliminary set of organizing elements for a regional climate-change strategy.

In the next two months we hope to fill out the elements with additional detail and to sharpen the areas requiring policy decisions and imminent actions. We expect, however, that the region's approach to climate change will continue to evolve well beyond our "final" report in May. Climate change is a relatively simple physical phenomenon, but effectively addressing the issues associated with climate change may require some very complex and contentious political, social and economic choices. After May, there will remain many questions to be answered. Vice President Gore is correct: the will to act is a renewable resource. But we expect that resource may need to be renewed repeatedly over the next several years. Inevitably this region's climate-change strategy shall encounter a variety of real and imagined challenges, requiring not only renewed willpower but also a high capacity to learn and adapt. Thankfully, much of that learning and adaptation is already underway as evidenced by the high and growing public interest in the climate-change issue and an increased openness to unconventional solutions.

Our strategic thoughts rely heavily on ideas contributed by government and business leaders, key stakeholders, and members of the general public from throughout the Bay Area—first at the Air District's Climate Summit in November and then at two JPC-sponsored workshops in February. Our first workshop was on February 16th and was attended by over 150 people. To accommodate those who had to be turned away from the first workshop, we arranged for a second workshop on February 23rd. This was attended by nearly 100 people. In addition to those in physical attendance, there was a webcast audience which participated in the discussion via e-mail. Each workshop, lasting about three hours, involved active discussion among the participants and written submissions. As this memo is being written, staff is continuing to mine 298 pages of open-ended questionnaires, eighty-five comment cards with specific action ideas and a out ninety-eight pages of e-mails. These supplement and expand upon nearly one-hundred separate ideas documented from the breakout groups at the Air District's Climate Summit. All of this material is available for review on the JPC's website.

From this rich resource of ideas, some general themes are beginning to emerge. These constitute the basic organizing elements of a strategy: a set of exploratory paths along which a number of potential actions are arrayed. As in a hiking guide, some of the paths can be categorized as “easy or moderate” in difficulty. Others may be identified as “treacherous,” or “only for the adventurous.” However, even the easy paths may have a few trip hazards, and some of the treacherous paths will have sections of level and stable ground. In the description that follows, the strategy elements are more-or-less ranked from relatively easy to relatively risky.

The Goal: To Set an Example Which Others Will Follow

Regardless of the path, there is remarkable consensus around the destination. This destination is best captured in Jack Broadbent’s opening remarks at the November Climate Summit. JPC members will remember this as his final key message: “Working together, the Bay Area will be a model for California, the nation and the world.” This message resonated throughout our two workshops. There was an explicit recognition that if all the Bay Area did was limit its own carbon emissions, this would have a negligible impact on the global problem. This region’s real power over global climate change will rest in its ability to innovate and to set examples which others will rush to emulate. The regional agencies can lead in setting and disseminating those examples. If the Bay Area can continue to establish world-class models—as it has in technology, commerce, the arts and other areas of human endeavor—then it can have impact on the global environment far beyond its nominal emission reductions or climate adaptations.

Strategy Element 1: Establish Priorities

Participants in our climate-change discussions submitted a veritable catalog of ideas covering a wide range of subjects and sectors. They were also candid in acknowledging that if we tried to pursue every good idea all at once, we would inevitably fail. It may be a climate crisis, but our resources are still limited, and we need to carefully choose those initiatives which will have the greatest impact relative to the monetary—and political—capital expended. While there is some obvious low-hanging fruit, many initiatives will require either significant expenditures or significant tradeoffs relative to other objectives. It is imperative that the regional agencies do our homework and select these with caution, applying at least a rudimentary, and in some cases a rigorous, benefit/cost calculus.

In making our selection, we would be wise to look first at those initiatives which offer “co-benefits,” that not only reduce carbon emissions or facilitate adaptation but simultaneously advance other regional objectives. An obvious example is source control which mitigates CO₂ coincidentally with reducing particulate matter or ozone. A less obvious example is smart growth, which can reduce carbon by reducing the need to travel while also helping to revitalize distressed communities and improving public health by providing more opportunities to walk and bicycle.

Our participants also reminded us that we needed to not just be conscious of effectiveness and efficiency; that, as we identified climate initiatives, we also had to be sensitive to equity issues. As in New Orleans after Katrina, those most affected by climate change will be those with the fewest resources to cope. As well, many of our well-intentioned mitigations may have differential and devastating impacts on the poor. For example, increased fuel prices are frequently advo-

cated as a way of reducing unnecessary and inefficient driving. For most of us, higher prices might cause us to reduce discretionary driving or switch to a more efficient vehicle. To the poor family, which depends on an older car to get to a distant work location, it could involve a choice between gas and food.

Strategy Element 2: Increase Public Awareness

This is the “beginner” hiking path. It builds on initiatives already underway among the regional agencies, particularly at the Air District, it acknowledges that aggregated individual behaviors can make a big difference, and it recognizes that for most media the Bay Area is a single communications market, where information may be most effectively and efficiently delivered at the regional level and through the regional agencies. Awareness is such an obvious and urgent regional action that it may be proceed in advance of other strategy elements.

Participants urged us to deliver two principal messages:

1. Climate change is an urgent issue, both globally and locally (Our slide show on local implications seemed to be revelatory to many.);
2. There are many actions which we can take as individuals, as businesses, as groups and associations, as cities and counties, and as a region. These range from the simple and easy, like replacing our light bulbs or inflating our tires, to the more difficult, like reshaping the way the region grows.

However, participants also cautioned us against being too clever, too preachy and too monochromatic. They encouraged us to build relevant messages from a grassroots, inclusive process, noting the diversity of communities and interests in the Bay Area. And they suggested putting an emphasis on young people and the schools. The next generation really has a vested interest in this issue, and it may be easier to build new habits than extinguish old ones.

Among the most compelling awareness ideas was the suggestion that we should be providing people with nearly real-time feedback on the carbon emission implications of their choices and behaviors. Imagine, for example, the morning radio traffic report which totals potential carbon emissions based on congestion conditions; or the 511 response that goes something like this: “That trip should take you forty minutes and will result in about forty pounds of carbon dioxide,” or more positively “By choosing to take the bus for that trip, you will reduce your potential carbon impact by forty pounds.”

Strategy Element 3: Provide Assistance

This, too, is nearly a no-brainer. It is based on regional economies of scale and on avoiding duplication of effort and invention. The regional agencies can collectivize a number of activities to assist local governments and other organizations in assessing and undertaking climate initiatives. Examples of regional assistance include:

- The standardization of carbon inventory procedures and the dissemination of inventory data and tools (as underway at the Air District);
- The establishment and maintenance of a clearinghouse for ideas, experiences and best practices;
- The certification of carbon reduction plans (building on ABAG's Green Business program);
- The development of model codes and other tools for climate protection and for adaptation;
- The collective retention and delivery of specialized consultant services;
- The funding of demonstration projects (as through the Air District's nascent climate innovation grant program or a variation on MTC's TLC program).

One interesting suggestion was the coordination of innovation among multiple local governments so that new local climate practices or laws appear nearly simultaneously across the region or at least across sub-regions. This would pool some of the risks of being first and would mitigate the tendency of affected parties to shop among jurisdictions for the most favorable climate-related regulations.

Strategy Element 4: Reduce Unnecessary Driving

Participants at both the Climate Summit and at our workshops were acutely aware that fully one-half of the Bay Area's greenhouse gas emissions result from transportation sources and mostly from private on-road vehicles. They also understood that technological improvements (e.g., new engines, smaller and lighter cars, emission control devices, and alternative fuels) were likely at best to take us only half way toward the State's aggressive greenhouse-gas targets for this sector. Therefore, there was a high emphasis on changing driving behavior, particularly on decreasing unnecessary trips and reducing excessively long trip lengths. A number of suggestions were proffered; two general categories of regional policy stand out: (1) smart growth and (2) price signals.

Most participants acknowledged that smart growth was a relatively slow, incremental solution and was unlikely to have a significant impact on the State's shorter-term emission targets. However, they did persuasively contend that redistributing growth to promote accessibility via transit and via propinquity could be immensely powerful in the longer term (say over fifty years). They also argued that smart growth was one of a few potential solutions which promised to help reduce greenhouse gases without significant compromises to our present quality of life. Indeed, smart growth offers many co-benefits (e.g., more housing choices, more lively and vital neighborhoods, and a generally more secure environment) which could actually improve the livability of the Bay Area. We were also reminded that just because smart-growth was a long-term proposition did not mean that urgent action on this front was not required now. Because smart-growth occurs cumulatively, actions taken today are at least as important as actions taken twenty years from now. In fact, current actions may be significantly more important, as they can set positive examples which then play out in expanding emulations over multiple years. There was a

great deal of support exhibited for the regional agencies' *FOCUS* efforts and encouragement for accelerating these through regional incentives.

To complement and encourage the redistribution of growth, many encouraged the region to send stronger price signals to vehicle drivers. Pricing was identified as a strategy which might have very substantial effects even in the short term. The idea came in many flavors: increased gas taxes and fees ("public goods charges"); vehicle registration fees, surcharges and rebates (applied differentially by vehicle type and use); higher tolls; congestion pricing (including congested area entrance charges as in London and hot lanes as in Southern California); and higher parking rates (perhaps implemented through a regional parking space tax). Most of these ideas would require State legislation permitting the region to take the appropriate action.

In the ideal world as envisioned by our workshop participants, road pricing and similar disincentives to driving would be accompanied by measures which made the alternatives, particularly transit, more competitive and attractive. Many suggested free transit, but we suspect that fare price may be one of the least powerful impediments to transit ridership. Convenience factors, such as those being addressed by MTC through TransLink[®] and other connectivity efforts, may be way more important. Nevertheless, we agree that transit, along with pedestrian and bike improvements, will need to be a big part of how we confront climate change in this region.

As we consider alternatives in the area of pricing and mode competitiveness, it is critically important to remember that not all segments of society will be affected equally. Consumption taxes and fees on basic commodities, like access, can be highly regressive and we do not yet provide the full range of choices that will allow everyone to respond without some significant hardships, particularly for many of the currently disadvantaged. The economics of transportation and development is highly charged with equity issues; and if the Bay Area is to be a model, it needs to continue to develop policy with high sensitivity to these issues.

Strategy Element 5: Prepare to Adapt

Regardless of what we do over the next several years to reduce carbon emissions, global warming is well underway, some consequences are inevitable, and the Bay Area *will* experience moderate to severe impacts. While neither attendees at the Climate Summit nor at the workshop emphasized adaptation as a priority, many did acknowledge that we will still need to begin preparing at minimum for changes in sea level, average temperatures, and potable water supply. We will also have to start anticipating other potential impacts which are not presently on our radar.

Adaptation will require new and more severe ground-level air-pollution strategies, as higher temperatures will cook more ozone. Our local governments and water districts may have to implement very restrictive water conservation measures to compensate for the loss in snow pack. And we will have to reassess our whole approach to development and capital investment near the shoreline.

BCDC has commenced a reconsideration of its mandate under conditions of sea-level rise. Its thoughts and processes are illustrative of the potential magnitude of the adaptation task. Using GIS data, BCDC has prepared maps which show that a one-meter increase in the level of the Bay

could flood over 200 square miles of land around the Bay. The value of the development threatened with inundation could exceed \$100 billion. The Bay Commission next proposes to determine more precisely the monetary value of all economic and environmental resources within the area expected to be impacted; estimate the cost of protecting these resources through the construction of levees, sea walls or raising the elevation of infrastructure; decide whether it might be more cost-effective to remove or relocate some developed areas rather than protect them; and develop a regional vision for San Francisco Bay that would accommodate projected sea level rise and protect the most significant economic, environmental, aesthetic, social, cultural and historic resources from flooding while continuing to enhance the biological productivity of the estuary. That is a lot of consequential and expensive work.

Strategy Element 6: Change the Rules

In our hiking guide, the description of this strategy path might contain words like “largely unexplored territory; may contain some steep inclines, dangerous drop-offs, loose footing, and rattle snakes—but may also lead to some worthy and occasionally spectacular vistas.” This is the strategy element that more than any other recognizes that “business as usual” will not be good enough, that some paradigm shifts or a sea changes may be required to model truly effective climate protection—that the rules by which we plan and govern this region may have to be fundamentally altered. Some, but not all, of these changes are likely to be difficult and controversial; others are mostly just different. Regardless of degree of unconventionality, now is the time to begin reconsidering how we as a region deal with many common and not-so-common things. We may find some ideas which, with some planning, are more doable and acceptable than they at first appear.

Staff is still very much in mid-stream in cataloging, categorizing and understanding the rule-change ideas presented at the Summit and at our workshops. Here are a very few examples presented without judgment to illustrate the range of possibilities:

- Make CO₂ impact the primary criterion in CEQA reviews (The regional agencies might be able to readily trigger this requirement by all including a critical question in their comment letters prepared in response to CEQA project documents.);
- Apply life-cycle costing to all capital projects (i.e., include the costs of long-term operation—particularly those related to energy consumption—in the calculation and reporting of project costs);
- De-emphasize congestion relief as a transportation investment priority (i.e., use congestion to meter travel growth and mitigate induced development, particularly sprawl);
- Encourage energy-efficient development with sliding-scale permit fees and rebates;
- Return the region’s freeways to a maximum fifty-five-mile-per-hour speed limit, as it was following the seventies’ energy crisis;

- Universalize multi-modal level-of-service (LOS) standards (based on people moving capacity) as an alternative to those based purely on automobile traffic;
- Condition transportation project funding on CO₂ emissions impact;
- Impose an indirect-source development fee as in the San Joaquin air basin.

Over the next few weeks, we anticipate adding many other examples to this list. We will then work with the JPC to identify a process for selecting the most promising for further analysis and discussion.

Conclusion

While some skeptics remain, few of us now doubt that the world's climate is changing—and changing very rapidly. Changing even more quickly is the climate of public interest and policy discourse on this matter. Global warming now commands a level of intensity, urgency and seriousness which a few months ago would have been nearly unthinkable. Public support to take decisive action is growing; and, through the examples they set, the Bay Area's regional agencies are uniquely poised to lead the region, the state, the nation and the world.